

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicants have canceled claims **1 – 3, 6, 7, 9 – 11, 14, 15, 17, 28, 35, 38, 39, 40 and 51**, and amended claims **18, 29, 41 and 46** to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims **18 – 25, 29 – 34, 36 and 41 - 50** are presented for examination.

In Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims **1 – 3, 6, 7, 9 – 11, 14, 15, 17 – 19, 23 – 25, 29, 30, 34 – 36, 38 and 40** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al., US Pub. No. 2004/0189707 A1 ("Moore") in view of <http://Fototime.com/ftweb/fahelp/> published web pages 212.htm, 138.htm and 210.htm ("Fototime"). Applicants have canceled claims **1 – 3, 6, 7, 9 – 11, 14, 15, 17, 38 and 40** without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection, and respectfully submit that rejection of these claims is thus rendered moot. Therefore only claims **18, 19, 23 – 25, 29, 30, 34 and 36** remain rejected in these paragraphs under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims **28, 39 and 41 - 51** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Fototime and further in view of Smith, US Pub. No 2003/0039408 A1 ("Smith"). Applicants have canceled claims **28, 39 and 51** without acquiescence to the Examiner's reasons for rejection, and respectfully submit that rejection of these claims is thus rendered moot. Therefore only claims **41 - 50** remain rejected in these paragraphs under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 20 – 22 and 31 – 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Fototime and further in view of Drucker, US Pub. No. 2006/0161867 A1 ("Drucker").

Distinctions between Claimed Invention and U.S. Pub No. 2004/0189707 A1 to Moore in view of published web pages of Fototime, in view of US Pub. No. 2003/0039408 A1 to Smith, and further in view of US Pub. No. 2006/0161867 A1 to Drucker

Moore, Fototime and Drucker have been addressed in applicants' previous responses filed on November 15, 2006 and April 12, 2007.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection in Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Smith describes an encoding method and system that encodes a three dimensional object model that is formed from a number of images that represent textures for different portions of the model (par. [0008]). The file size of an encoded model depends on the resolutions and compression quality settings of the individual images. Smith describes a user interface that enables a user to set a file size constraint for the overall encoded model (slider 110 of FIG. 2; slider 310 of FIG. 4), and the method and system then automatically determines resolutions and compression quality settings so that the overall model meets the size constraint. (FIG. 2; FIG. 4). The user interface of Smith enables the user to interactively render and view the encoded model, and adjust resolutions and compression qualities accordingly (sliders 130, 131, 140 and 141 of FIG. 2; Low/Medium/High level settings of FIG. 4).

Smith's user interface includes controls (checkboxes 132 and 142 of FIG. 2; checkboxes 327 and 337 of FIG. 4) for locking some resolution or compression quality settings, while allowing other settings to be automatically determined so that the overall encoded model meets the file size constraint.

In distinction to Smith, which concerns locking of encoding parameters, the present invention concerns locking of activation states of filters. The filters themselves have modifiable parameters, but the lock mechanism of the present invention applies to the filters' activation states and not to the filters' parameters. The locking mechanism of claims **41** and **46** has the properties that

- (i) an unlocked content filter is automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified, and
- (ii) a locked content filter is not automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified.

Such mechanism may be tabularly summarized as

Action	Effect
Activate a filter	De-activate other filters that are unlocked Do not de-active other filters that are locked
Modify a filter's parameters	De-activate other filters that are unlocked Do not de-active other filters that are locked

Such a mechanism, involving (a) activation states, (b) filter parameters and (c) activation state locks, is not described in Smith or in any of the cited prior art.

Similarly, the locking mechanism of claims **18** and **29** apply to the metadata activation states and not to the metadata property values.

The rejections of the claims **18 – 25, 29 – 34, 36** and **41 - 50** in paragraphs 2 - 5 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent claim **18** for a computer readable storage medium, applicants respectfully submit that the limitations in claim **18** of

"instructions for an interface for generating a plurality of metadata constraints, wherein each constraint sets at least one value for a metadata property, for modifying values associated with the generated metadata constraints, and for selectively activating or de-activating the generated metadata constraints by respectively checking

or un-checking checkboxes corresponding to the constraints, wherein each metadata constraint can be independently activated or de-activated without affecting the activation status and settings of the other metadata constraints", and

"a constraint lock processor for locking at least one metadata constraint so as to remain activated when other metadata constraints are activated or de-activated, or when other metadata constraint property values are modified"

are neither shown nor suggested in Moore, Fototime, Smith or Drucker.

Because claims **19 - 25** depend from claim **18** and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims **19 - 25** are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Moore, Fototime, Smith, Drucker, or a combination of Moore, Fototime, Smith and Drucker.

Accordingly claims **18 - 25** are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent method claim **29**, applicants respectfully submit that the limitations in claims **29** of

"generating a plurality of metadata constraints, wherein each constraint sets one or more values for a metadata property",

"selectively activating or de-activating the generated metadata constraints by respectively checking or un-checking checkboxes corresponding to the constraints, wherein each metadata constraint can be independently activated or de-activated without affecting the activation status and settings of the other metadata constraints",
and

"locking at least one metadata constraint so as to remain activated when other metadata constraints are activated or de-activated, or when other metadata constraint property values are modified"

are neither shown nor suggested in Moore, Fototime, Smith or Drucker.

Because claims **30 - 34** and **36** depend from claim **29** and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims **30 - 34** and **36** are not

anticipated or rendered obvious by Moore, Fototime, Smith, Drucker, or a combination of Moore, Fototime, Smith and Drucker.

Accordingly claims **29 – 34** and **36** are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent claim **41** for a computer readable storage medium, applicants respectfully submit that the limitation in claim **41** of

"instructions for a plurality of filter interfaces for setting parameters of corresponding content filters that filter a catalog of assets, each content filter having an activation status of being in an active or inactive state and having a lock status of being in a locked or an unlocked state, and each filter interface having a display generator for rendering a user interface display, wherein at least one such user interface display for a content filter contains content that is filtered according to one or more other content filters, and wherein (i) an unlocked content filter is automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified, and (ii) a locked content filter is not automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified", and is neither shown nor suggested in Moore, Fototime or Smith.

Because claims **42 – 45** depend from claim **41** and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims **42 – 45** are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Moore, Fototime, Smith, or a combination of Moore, Fototime and Smith.

Accordingly claims **41 – 45** are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent method claim **46**, applicants respectfully submit that the limitation in claim **46** of

"rendering a user interface display for a content filter, that contains content that is filtered according to one or more other content filters, and wherein (i) an unlocked content filter is automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified, and (ii) a locked content filter is not automatically de-activated when another content filter is activated or modified"

is neither shown nor suggested in Moore, Fototime or Smith.

Because claims 47 – 50 depend from claim 46 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 47 – 50 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Moore, Fototime, Smith, or a combination of Moore, Fototime and Smith.

Accordingly claims 46 – 50 are deemed to be allowable.

Support for Amended Claims in Original Specification

Claim 18 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of original claim 28. Claim 29 as been amended to incorporate the limitation of original claims 38 and 39.

Claims 41 and 46 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of an unlocked content filter being automatically de-activated when another content filter is modified, and a locked content filter not being automatically de-activated when another content filter is modified. These limitations are described in the original specification at element 280 of FIG. 2 and its caption, and at pars. [0040] – [0043].


For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Oct. 4, 2007



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300